



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/565,471

01/20/2006

Han-Kyo Lee

JCLA19107

9899

7590
J. C. Patents Inc.
4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618

09/17/2008

EXAMINER

HELLING, KAITLYN ELIZABETH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

4166

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/565,471	Applicant(s) LEE, HAN-KYO	
	Examiner KAITLYN E. HELLING	Art Unit 4166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 January 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/20/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Reference numeral 9 is mentioned in the specification as pertaining to the massage protrusions. It appears that this reference numeral should be an 8 as this is the numeral given to the massage protrusions previously. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1, 6, 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2003/0093915 to Pearl et al. (Pearl) in view of U.S. 2004/0006332 A1 to Black (Black).

In Reference to Claim 1

Pearl teaches:

An alopecia healing apparatus ([003], Page 1) comprising:

Art Unit: 4166

a case provided at a first end thereof with a handle section, and a second end thereof with a massage section having a plurality of massage protrusions (Fig. 1);

a light radiating section including a plurality of LEDs (Abstract), which are regularly aligned behind the massage protrusions of the case (Abstract) in equidistance (Fig. 1);

a laser radiating section (Abstract) aligned in the case corresponding to the massage section so as to radiate low-level laser beam (Fig. 1);

a control section including a microcomputer ([0072] Page 6) for controlling operations of the light radiating section, the laser radiating section and the vibration device; and

a power source for supplying power to the light radiating section and the laser radiating section (18, Fig. 1 and [0060] Page 5).

However, Pearl does not teach:

a vibration device installed in the case so as to vibrate the case;

Black teaches:

a vibration device installed in the case so as to vibrate the case (Abstract);

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the vibration device of Black with the apparatus of Pearl since Black teaches the combination of light and vibration therapies in order to massage

Art Unit: 4166

the body structures and improve the transparency to the light beams to provide additional or alternative massaging effects ([0006], Page 2).

In Reference to Claim 6

Pearl in view of Black teaches the apparatus of claim 1, with Black teaching the further limitation of the laser radiating section including a laser source (Fig. 7) installed at a rear portion of a cylindrical member and a lens section installed at a front portion of the cylindrical member (Fig. 7 and Col. 7, lines 31-44). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have selected the laser and lens configuration of Black in order to allow the light to contact the user as taught by the Black (Col. 2, lines 13-28).

In Reference to Claim 7

Pearl in view of Black teaches the apparatus of claim 1, with Black teaching the further limitation of the vibration device including a vibrator motor ([0006], Page 2) capable of vibrating itself. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have selected a motor as that mechanical means of vibration in order to provide the therapeutic effects of the vibration ([0006], Page 2).

In Reference to Claim 11

Pearl teaches an alopecia healing apparatus having a light radiating section and a laser radiating section, but not a continuously repetitive cycle. Black teaches that depending on the hygienic effect sought it may be advantageous to provide for varying parameters such as pulse, repetition rate, and pulse duration (Col. 2, lines 29-57) as

Art Unit: 4166

well as the addition of vibration (Col. 10, lines 30-53). While not specifically pointed out in Black, it would be inherent that the varying parameter settings of Black would allow for the repeatedly switching on/off the light radiating section for 30 seconds as a vibration device is operated and a second step of radiating light for 30 seconds by using the light radiating section. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention to have modified Pearl to include the varying parameter of pulsing and repetition to achieve the desired treatment as taught by Black (Col.2, lines 30-53).

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2003/0093915 to Pearl et al. in view of U.S. 2004/0006332 A1 to Black as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of U.S. 3,967,372 to Beck et al. (Beck).

Pearl in view of Black teaches the apparatus of claim 1, but not the handle section inclined from the massage section. Beck teaches the use of an inclination between a head assembly and the handle portion so as to make it more convenient to grasp the handle of the shaver and apply the head against the user (Col. 2, lines 35-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Pearl and Black with the inclination of the head with respect to the handle for a more convenient grasp and application to the user as taught by Beck (Col. 2, lines 35-39).

Similarly with respect to the angle being 15°, the prior art need not disclose the exact angle of inclination which will optimize the contact area of the treatment portion of an apparatus. As such, the angle 15° does not render the claim patentably distinct as this angle would result from routine experimentation.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2003/0093915 to Pearl et al. in view of U.S. 2004/0006332 A1 to Black as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. 4,924,541 to Inagaki (Inagaki).

Pearl in view of Black teaches the apparatus of claim 1, but not the use of synthetic resin as the massage protrusion material. Inagaki teaches the use of synthetic resin as a way to promote blood circulation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used synthetic resin for the massage protrusions for its comfortable touch to the body portions of the user because of its appropriate rigidity and flexibility (Col. 2, lines 50-53).

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2003/0093915 to Pearl et al. and U.S. 2004/0006332 A1 to Black as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. 6,739,016 B2 to Bigio (Bigio).

Pearl in view of Black teaches the apparatus of claim 1, but not the shape of the massage protrusions. Bigio teaches wherein the length of the massage protrusions is gradually increased from a center to upper and lower directions thereof so that uppermost and lowest protrusions have the longest length (Fig. 14, and Col. 8, lines 11-

Art Unit: 4166

32). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the bristle configuration of Bigio with the apparatus of Pearl and Black in view of Inagaki to provide an anatomically correct device and promotes more contact between the apparatus and the scalp (Col. 2, lines 5-12).

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2003/0093915 to Pearl et al. in view of U.S. 2004/0006332 A1 to Black as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. 4,732,834 to Honda et al. (Honda).

Pearl in view of Black teaches the apparatus of claim 1, but not the use of a light collecting section with a Cr-coated film in order to prevent the light radiating from the LEDs from being dispersed into an exterior and in order to make linear-type light. Honda, however, teaches the use of a light collecting member (Abstract) with a reflection preventive layer in the inside (Abstract), and the use of a chromium coating (Col. 9, lines 66-68 and Col. 10, lines 1-2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Pearl and Black with the light collecting section of Honda in order to reduce the occurrence of interference fringe due to the interference phenomenon (Abstract).

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2003/0093915 to Pearl et al. in view of U.S. 2004/0006332 A1 to Black as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. 3,938,018 to Dahl (Dahl).

Art Unit: 4166

Pearl in view of Black teaches the apparatus of claim 1, but not the use of the specific power source. Dahl, however, teaches the use of a chargeable battery (Abstract), a charge terminal formed at a lower end of the case (Col. 3, lines 30-34), and an adapter to charge the battery by receiving the case therein (Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Pearl and Black with the charging system of Dahl in order to facilitate automatic charging without the user having to worry about plugging or unplugging various connections as taught by Dahl (Col. 1, lines 33-45).

8. Claims 9, 10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2003/0093915 to Pearl et al. in view of U.S. 2004/0006332 A1 to Black as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. 6,450,941 B1 to Larsen (Larsen).

In Reference to Claims 9 and 10

Pearl in view of Black teaches the apparatus of claim 1, but not the specific lasers being a He-Ne laser with a wavelength about 630-660nm or a Ga-As laser with a wavelength of about 790-904nm. Larsen, however, teaches the laser to have a wavelength between 350 and 1200nm (Abstract) and more specifically in the infrared light range of 600-1200nm as this has been discovered to be capable of stimulating the mitochondria while at the same time possessing a sufficient penetration depth (Col. 1, lines 49-51).

Art Unit: 4166

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used a laser within the wavelength range of Larsen to achieve the therapeutic benefit of stimulation and adequate penetration. Similarly, while Larsen does not teach the He-Ne or Ga-As lasers specifically, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have selected a laser on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice (See MPEP 2144).

In Reference to Claims 13 and 14

Pearl in view of Black teaches the apparatus of claim 6, but not the specific lasers being a He-Ne laser with a wavelength about 630-660nm or a Ga-As laser with a wavelength of about 790-904nm. Larsen, however, teaches the laser to have a wavelength between 350 and 1200nm (Abstract) and more specifically in the infrared light range of 600-1200nm as this has been discovered to be capable of stimulating the mitochondria while at the same time possessing a sufficient penetration depth (Col. 1, lines 49-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used a laser within the wavelength range of Larsen to achieve the therapeutic benefit of stimulation and adequate penetration. Similarly, while Larsen does not teach the He-Ne or Ga-As lasers specifically, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have selected a laser on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice (See MPEP 2144).

Art Unit: 4166

9. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2003/0093915 to Pearl et al., U.S. 2004/0006332 A1 to Black, and U.S. 4,924,541 to Inagaki as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of U.S. 6,739,016 B2 to Bigio (Bigio).

Pearl and Black in view of Inagaki teaches the apparatus of claim 3, but not the shape of the massage protrusions. Bigio teaches wherein the length of the massage protrusions is gradually increased from a center to upper and lower directions thereof so that uppermost and lowest protrusions have the longest length (Fig. 14, and Col. 8, lines 11-32). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the bristle configuration of Bigio with the apparatus of Pearl and Black in view of Inagaki to provide an anatomically correct device and promotes more contact between the apparatus and the scalp (Col. 2, lines 5-12).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. 2002/0173780 A1 to Altshuler et al. which discloses a method for photocosmetic and photodermatological treatment, and U.S. 3,659,180 to Urbrush teaches a self-charging appliance and stand.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAITLYN E. HELLING whose telephone number is (571)270-5845. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EDT.

Art Unit: 4166

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Bomberg can be reached on (571)272-4922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KH

/Kenneth Bomberg/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4166